

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were examined in the outstanding final office action mailed on 08/16/2006 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). All the claims were rejected. Claims 1-16 are respectfully presented for reconsideration further in view of the below remarks.

5

Drawings

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the amendments to the drawings submitted in the previous response dated 02 June 2006, and withdrawing the objections of the previous office action. The Examiner is also thanked for acknowledging the same in the Outstanding Office Action.

10

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The prior rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) (as being anticipated by U.S. Patent number 6,571,235 B1 issued to Marpe *et al* (hereinafter as "Marpe")) was maintained noting that the Applicant's arguments in the response dated 02 June 2006 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

15

Applicants respectfully traverse again.

As a basis for the traverse, Applicant first establishes how the Examiner appears to equate some example claimed terms to the components of Marpe:

No.	Claimed Term	Component of Marpe	Basis in the Office Action (Page, line number therein)
1.	First client system	any system which executes the interface of Figures 3/4/6/7 of Marpe to access multiple categories	"The preceding text clearly indicates that a first client system to enable user to access a plurality of databases <i>is an interface...</i> " (Page 3, lines 17-20, <i>Emphasis Added</i>)
20	2 database of interest	workbench database	"The preceding text clearly illustrates that the workbench database is a user specified database..." (Page 4, lines 17-20)
	3 search	search query that can be	"... the database is searched in

	criteria	specified in executive dashboard accessible from Figure 7 of Marpe	operation 1028 using the search query" (Page 4, lines 15-17) along with at least col 20 lines 30-50 of Marpe
4	Second client system	user or user system from which workbench database is accessible	"... the database of interest, which is the workbench database is accessible from a second client, which are users." (Page 4, lines 17-20)

25 Applicants first point out that the "client system" of claim 1 is akin to "user system" of Marpe, and it would be impermissible under the applicable principles of claim construction to equate the client systems to "users" (as appears to be done by the Examiner) since the subject application clearly uses the terms user and client system as different entities.

In addition, Applicants point out that claim 1 recites two different client systems - a first client system (in which the elements of claim 1 are performed) and a second client system to which the search criteria is sent.

30 Applicants do not find the claimed feature of "sending said search criteria to said second client..." in Marpe within the meaning of such construction of two client systems.

In particular, for such a feature to be anticipated by Marpe, when the search query of Marpe is issued from one user system, the search query has to be sent to another user system from which the workbench database is accessible.

35 The teachings of Marpe simply do not anticipate or suggest any user system (i.e., second client system) to which the such criteria is sent.

The Examiner disagrees with such a conclusion and asserts:

40 sending said search criteria to said second client(i.e. "1. From this screen the user can: 1. Click "Edit search criteria" to return to the main search screen to edit the search criteria. 2. **Click "Generate Detail Report" to create a report of all the Status Reports that met the search criteria.**"The preceding text clearly indicates that when a user clicks "Generate Detail Report," **the search criteria are sent to the second client.** In addition, the fact that data is received from multiple users, may be

reasonably anticipated that the received data is by a second user, a third user, etc. When disseminating data, one can reasonably anticipate that the dissemination of data received by users would be those users who are designed to receive such access.)(Column 25, lines 41-43; Abstract);”

(Page 4, Lines 17 to Page 5 Lines 3 of the Outstanding Office Action, ***Emphasis Added***)

Thus it is concluded that the Examiner is asserting that the search criteria is sent to another user system (other than the one from which the user interface is being provided) when "Generate Detail Report" is clicked.

Applicant again disagree with the conclusion.

As a basis for that disagreement, Applicants now point to relevant portion of Marpe:

Search Function

Another area of functionality allows the user to search for one or more Status Reports in the Workbench database using a specified search criteria. FIG. 10A depicts an embodiment of the present invention which provides a method 1020 for querying a database which is storing a plurality of items generated by multiple users. In operation 1022, users are allowed to create an item with a plurality of fields. The item is stored in a database in operation 1024. The item should be stored with an identifier corresponding to the user. ***Upon receipt of a search query in operation 1026, the database is searched in operation 1028 using the search query.*** In operation 1030, the identifiers of a plurality of items found during the search are displayed. Upon selection of the associated identifier of one of the items, the fields of that item are depicted in operation 1032.

(Col 24, lines 37-52 of Marpe, ***Emphasis Added***)

Before addressing the emphasized portion of the above text, it is first noted that the search function of above is made available from the executive dashboard (see Table 1 in lines 53-60 of Col 20 of Marpe), which in turn is provided from a user system, which has been equated to the "first client system".

The Examiner attention is now directed to the emphasized language above, which clearly indicates that the database (believed to be workbench database) is searched when the search query is received.

The Applicants do not find any user system (i.e., the claimed second client system) between the issuance of the search criteria and the access of the database.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Marpe and withdrawal of the final rejection and continuation of examination is respectfully requested. Previously presented independent claim 13 is also allowable over Marpe at least for some of the reasons noted above. Claims 2-4 are allowable at least as depending from allowable base claim 1.

Claim 2 is independently allowable in reciting, "... enabling said user to specify ***any desired one of multiple client systems*** and an operation associated with data forming said corresponding response, said multiple client systems being comprised in said plurality of client systems; and executing ***said operation in said desired one of multiple client systems.***"

As noted above with respect to remarks in claim 1, the search query of Marpe is not sent to any other user system. In sharp contrast, claim 2 recites that the data of a previous response is received, and an operation can be executed using the received data on any (desired) one of multiple client systems.

Furthermore, the Examiner has committed a legal error in equating client systems with discussion groups in rejecting claim 2 (see page 6, lines 14-16 of the Outstanding Office Action, "Clearly the users can obtain access to certain ***client systems, which in this case are discussion groups*** by joining or requesting to join that particular discussion group"), while equating the client systems to users or user systems in rejecting claim 1, as noted above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the final rejection with respect to claim 2 is respected at least for some of the above noted reasons.

Previously presented claim 5 is also allowable over the art of record. Applicants first emphasize some of the amendments introduced in the response dated 02 June 2006:

means for access which can be instantiated from said new user application ***executing on a first client system which cannot access data in a first database, wherein said first database is accessible through a second client system, wherein***

5 *said first client system and said second client system are contained in said plurality of client systems*, wherein said means for access enables a user to specify said first database and a search query, wherein said first database is contained in said plurality of databases, wherein said means for access uses said first plurality of procedures *implemented in said second client system according to said first interface* to retrieve data matching said query.
(Previously presented claim 5, *Emphasis Added*)

10 Furthermore, Marpe is believed not to teach or suggest at least the features in the emphasized language above (of claim 5) at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 5 is accordingly believed to be allowable over the art of record. Independent claim 9 is also believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

15 Thus all the independent claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record. The dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from the corresponding allowable base claim.

Conclusion

20 Accordingly all the objections and rejections of record are believed to be overcome. Continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Date: October 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416